

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-6 are pending in the application; Claims 2-6 are amended and Claims 1 and 7-10 are cancelled by the present amendment. No new matter is added.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1-3 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over Debling (U.S. Pat. No. 6,973,592); Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Debling in view of Miura (U.S. Pat. No. 6,918,058); Claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. as unpatentable over Debling in view of Windows 2000 Device Driver Book (herein, "Win2k"); Claims 7, 8 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Debling in view of Mantley (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2003/0023793); and Claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Debling in view of Mantley in view of Win2k.

Addressing now the rejection of Claims 1-6 based on Debling, that rejection is traversed by the present response.

Claim 1 has been cancelled and the features found therein have been incorporated into newly independent Claims 2, 3 and 4.

Independent Claim 2 is directed to a multiprocessor system, and amended to now include the features below:

a selecting circuit for selecting, from among said plurality of processors, part or all of said plurality of processors to be debugged

Debling describes an on-chip emulator 120 which is connected to a microprocessor 110 and a USB interface 140. In a multi-chip system several USB interfaces 140 are connected to a single USB hub 170 which directs traffic from the several USB interfaces 140.

However, Debling does not describe or suggest a selecting circuit for selecting, from among said plurality of processors, part or all of said plurality of processors to be debugged.

The outstanding Office Action states on page 3, first paragraph that the USB hub 170 is equivalent to a selecting circuit for selecting, from among said plurality of processors, part or all of said plurality of processors to be debugged. However, the USB hub does not make any selection about which processor is going to be debugged, it merely combines received information.

In other words, the switching circuit recited in Claim 2 is used to select which microprocessor is to be debugged while Debling merely describes that several microprocessors can be debugged with the results combined at a USB hub 170.

For instance, in a non-limiting example, Fig. 1 shows CPU 7₀ and 7₁. The selecting circuit recited in Claim 2 decides if only one or both of the CPUs will be debugged. In contrast, in Fig. 2 of Debling, all of the CPUs 110 shown are debugged. There is no selecting circuit described or shown that selects which of the CPUs 110 will be debugged.


The further cited Miura, Win2k, and Mantley do not cure the above noted deficiencies of Debling.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 2 and similarly Claims 3 and 4 and claims depending therefrom patentably distinguish over Debling, Miura, Win2k, and Mantley considered individually or in any proper combination.

Consequently, in light of the above discussion and in view of the present amendment, the present application is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Eckhard H. Kuesters
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 28,870

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)

Surinder Sachar
Registration No. 34,423

I:\ATTY\JL\242358US\260024US_AM.DOC